



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/590,795	06/08/2000	Vishnu K. Agarwal	6047-53173	9849

7590 04/18/2005

Klarquist Sparkman Campbell  
Leigh & Winston LLP  
One World Trade Center Suite 1600  
121 S W Salmon Street  
Portland, OR 97204-2988

EXAMINER
----------

VU, DAVID

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2818

DATE MAILED: 04/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

H.A

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/590,795

Applicant(s)

AGARWAL ET AL.

Examiner

DAVID VU

Art Unit

2818

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 and 66-70 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 and 66-70 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 June 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 01/05/04; 01/26/04; 07/25/04 & 01/11/05
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claims 1-9, 12-31, 34 and 36 are rejected under 35 U. S. C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yamauchi et al. (US 6,284,587, herein after Yamauchi).

Yamauchi discloses a method of forming a ruthenium capacitor electrode by reducing ruthenium oxide layer under a nitrogen, He, Ne, Ar or Xe gas at 600°C in 3 minutes (col. 3, line 66 through col. 4, line 12) at 6.5mTorr to obtain an amorphous Ru layer (col. 5, lines 23-52).

2. Claims 32-35, 37, 38, 40-42 and 66-69 are rejected under 35 U. S. C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tanaka et al. (US 6,355,492, herein after Tanaka).

Tanaka discloses a method of forming a ruthenium capacitor electrode (col. 2, lines 9-12) by reducing ruthenium oxide layer under a nitrogen gas at 1773K to obtain a Ru layer having an average particle diameter of about 100,000Å (col. 6, lines 20-34).

3. Claims 20, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U. S. C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Phillips et al. (US 6,458,183, herein after Phillips).

Phillips discloses a method of converting ruthenium oxide layer to ruthenium by heating the layer in a reduced-pressure environment in a non-oxidizing ambient such as nitrogen/hydrogen, ammonia so as to produce a ruthenium-containing layer having a rough surface (See Abstract, col. 6, lines 7-21; col. 5, lines 29-39; col. 1, lines 21-26 and fig. 3).

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Yamauchi (US 6,284,587) in view of Tanaka (US Pat. 6,355,492).

Yamauchi fails to disclose the converting is performed at about 750°C or 800°C or higher.

However, Tanaka teaches in col. 6, lines 20-36, the converting is conducted at 1773K (1500°C). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the dry etching condition as taught by Tanaka in the process of Yamauchi. The converting condition does not define patentable over Yamauchi in view of Tanaka since temperature is well known processing variable and the discovery of the optimum or workable range involves only routine skill in the art. The specific temperature does not provide any critical or unexpected results to the method of manufacturing a conductive layer. Rather, it is merely an obvious selection of the dry etching temperature based on desired functional characteristics determinable by routine experimentation. In *Aller*, the court stated, "Where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456 105 USPQ 233,235 (CCPA 1995).

5. Claims 39 and 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka (US Pat. 6,355,492) in view of Kiyotoshi et al. (US Pat. 6,091,099, herein after Kiyotoshi).

Tanaka fails to disclose the electrode is defined by chemical mechanical polishing. However, Kiyotoshi teaches in col. 9, lines 65-67 and fig. 4C, the Ru film 213 is patterned by a chemical mechanical polishing to form a lower electrode of a capacitor. It would have been

Art Unit: 2818

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for forming the capacitor electrode layer as taught by Kiyotoshi in process for fabrication of Tanaka since patterned by a chemical mechanical polishing is recognized equivalent process for forming the electrode in a method of manufacturing a capacitor.

### **Conclusion**

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Vu whose telephone number is (571) 272-1798. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00am to 5:00pm. If attempt to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Nelms can be reached on (571) 272-1787. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR, Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



David Vu

April 10, 2005.